Minimal leptogenesis

Yuta Hamada[1] and Kiyoharu Kawana[1]

[1] *Department of Physics, Kyoto University, Kyoto 606-8502, Japan*

(Dated: October 20, 2015)

We propose a novel leptogenesis scenario at the reheating era. Our setup is minimal in the sense that, in addition to the standard model Lagrangian, we only consider an inflaton and higher dimensional operators. The lepton number asymmetry is produced not by the decay of a heavy particle, but by the scattering between the standard model particles. After the decay of an inflaton, the model is described within the standard model with higher dimensional operators. The Sakharov's three conditions are satisfied by the following way. The violation of the lepton number is realized by the dimension-5 operator. The complex phase comes from the dimension-6 four lepton operator. The universe is out of equilibrium before the reheating is completed. It is found that the successful baryogenesis is realized for the wide range of parameters, the inflaton mass and reheating temperature, depending on the cutoff scale. Since we only rely on the effective Lagrangian, our scenario can be applicable to all mechanisms to generate neutrino Majorana masses.

arXiv:1510.05186v1 [hep-ph] 18 Oct 2015

The discovered Higgs mass 125 GeV indicates that the standard model(SM) couplings are perturbative and the electroweak vacuum is (meta)stable even if the cutoff scale of the SM is around the Planck scale [1, 2]. The Higgs flat potential around the Planck scale may imply the connection between physics at the electroweak scale and at the Planck scale [3, 4]. Furthermore, the LHC does not find any significant deviations from the SM so far. These suggest the possibility that the SM is valid up to the very high scale. However, we know that there exists phenomena which can not be explained within the SM, one of which is the baryon asymmetry of the universe [5]

$$\frac{n_B}{s} \simeq (8.67 \pm 0.05) \times 10^{-11}, \tag{1}$$

where n_B is the number density of the baryon asymmetry and s is the entropy density of the universe. Taking into account these facts, it is important to consider the simple mechanism to realize the above value under the assumption that the SM is valid up to the very high scale.

There are many proposals to create the baryon asymmetry such as GUT baryogenesis [6], Affleck Dine baryogenesis [7], electroweak baryogenesis [8], baryogenesis via leptogenesis [9], string scale baryogenesis [10] and so on.

Among the various possibilities, one of the most simple scenario is leptogenesis in which heavy new particles are introduced, and the lepton number is produced by the decay of them. Then, the lepton number is converted into the baryon number by the non-perturbative effect of the SM, namely, the sphaleron process [11, 12]. The heavy particles are created by the thermal production [9] or decay of an inflaton [13] at the early stage of the universe. For example, a heavy particle is the right handed neutrino, triplet scalar [14] or triplet fermion [15].

In this letter, we propose a novel leptogenesis scenario. In contrast to the conventional scenario, we consider the case where the mass of a heavy particle is larger than the reheating temperature T_R. This situation would be reasonable because it may be natural that the mass of a heavy particle is around the GUT scale, $\mathcal{O}(10^{15})$ GeV, and it is not easy to obtain such a high reheating temperature. We show that the observed baryon asymmetry can be explained even in this case. In our scenario, on-shell heavy particles are not produced, and the lepton asymmetry is generated not by the decay of a heavy particle, but by the scattering between the SM particles at the reheating era. Because the energy scale after the inflation is always smaller than the mass of a heavy particle, we can use the effective Lagrangian:

$$\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}_{SM} + \frac{1}{\Lambda_1}\lambda_{1,ij} H H \bar{L_j^c} L_i + \frac{1}{\Lambda_2^2}\lambda_{2,ijkl}(\bar{L_i}\gamma^\mu L_j)(\bar{L_k}\gamma_\mu L_l) + h.c.$$
$$\ni \frac{v^2}{2\Lambda_1}(\bar{\nu^c}\nu + \bar{\nu}\nu^c), \tag{2}$$

where $v \simeq 246$ GeV, H is the Higgs doublet, $\mathcal{L}_{\rm SM}$ represents the SM Lagrangian, L is the lepton doublet and ν represents the left handed neutrino.[1] Although there are a lot of dimension-6 operators [16], we only consider one which is relevant for our discussion below. We can make $\lambda_{1,ij}$ real diagonal by the unitary transformation of L_i. In general, $\lambda_{2,ijkl}$ becomes complex in this basis. From Eq. (2), the mass of the neutrino $m_{\nu,i}$ is

$$\frac{m_{\nu,i}}{2} = \frac{v^2}{2\Lambda_1}\lambda_{1,ii}. \tag{4}$$

From this, we can estimate as

$$\Lambda_1 \simeq 1.5 \times 10^{14}\,\text{GeV}\left(\frac{0.1\,\text{eV}}{m_\nu}\right), \tag{5}$$

if the neutrino is Majorana particle. Here we have assumed $\lambda_{1,11} \simeq \lambda_{1,22} \simeq \lambda_{1,33} \simeq 1$ and $m_\nu := m_{\nu,1} \simeq$

[1] By performing the Fierz transformation, the last term is equivalent to

$$\frac{1}{\Lambda_2^2}\lambda_{2,ijkl}(\bar{L_i}\gamma^\mu L_j)(\bar{L_k}\gamma_\mu L_l) = 2\frac{1}{\Lambda_2^2}\lambda_{2,ijkl}(\bar{L_i^c}L_l)(\bar{L_k}L_j^c). \tag{3}$$

Therefore, the action here is equivalent to that of Ref. [10] although the situation is different. The decay of the higher excited state of string theory is considered in Ref. [10].

$m_{\nu,2} \simeq m_{\nu,3}$. On the other hand, the value of Λ_2 depends on ultraviolet models. For example, $\Lambda_2 = \mathcal{O}(10^{15})\,\mathrm{GeV}$ for the type-I seesaw mechanism [17], as we will discuss later. We can also take more small Λ_2.

The mechanism to create the lepton asymmetry we consider in this letter is as follows. At the reheating era, the high energy SM particles are produced by the decay of an inflaton. Then, the scattering between them and particles in thermal plasma generates the lepton asymmetry of the universe. This process is out of equilibrium. The violation of the lepton number comes from the second term in Eq. (2), and the third term has complex phase which induces CP violation.

Now let us evaluate the amount of the baryon asymmetry generated by this mechanism. When the sphaleron process is in thermal equilibrium, the relation between the baryon and lepton asymmetry becomes

$$\frac{n_B}{s} \simeq \frac{28}{79}\frac{n_L}{s} \tag{6}$$

in the SM. Here n_L is the number density of the lepton asymmetry.

In our scenario, there are two kinds of contributions to the lepton asymmetry. First contribution is that, while the decay of an inflaton itself does not lead to any asymmetry, the scattering between the SM particles induces both of the lepton number and CP violation, see Fig. 2 for the diagram contributing to the lepton asymmetry. Second contribution is that the CP violation is induced by the decay of an inflaton into lepton pairs (see Fig. 3), and the lepton number violation is occurred by the succeeding dimension-5 lepton number violating interaction.

As for the first contribution, n_L is roughly given by

$$\frac{n_L}{s} \sim \frac{n_{\rm inf}}{s}\sum_i 2\epsilon_i \mathrm{Br}_i \frac{\Gamma_{\not L}}{\Gamma_{\rm brems}}. \tag{7}$$

Let us explain the meaning of teach of the factors in Eq. (7) below. The first factor is abundance of an inflaton, which can be written by

$$\frac{n_{\rm inf}}{s} \simeq \frac{3}{4}\frac{T_R}{m_{\rm inf}}. \tag{8}$$

Second, ϵ_i represents the efficiency

$$\epsilon_i := 2\,\frac{\sigma_{\bar L_i \bar L_i \to HH} - \sigma_{L_i L_i \to HH}}{\sigma_{\bar L_i \bar L_i \to HH} + \sigma_{L_i L_i \to HH}}, \tag{9}$$

where σ represents the cross section of each process. This can be written by

$$\epsilon_i \simeq \sum_j \frac{1}{2\pi}\frac{m_{\rm inf}^2}{\Lambda_2^2}\frac{\lambda_{1,jj}\mathrm{Im}(\lambda_{2,ij})}{\lambda_{1,ii}}, \tag{10}$$

where $\lambda_{2,ij} := \lambda_{2,ijij}$.

Next, Br_i denotes the branching ratio of an inflaton to $L_i\bar L_i$. We note that the baryon asymmetry vanishes if we take $\mathrm{Br}_1 = \mathrm{Br}_2 = \mathrm{Br}_3$, and therefore we simply assume that this is not the case. Indeed, there is no reason to consider $\mathrm{Br}_1 = \mathrm{Br}_2 = \mathrm{Br}_3$. In the following, we take $\mathrm{Br} := \mathrm{Br}_1 \neq 0, \mathrm{Br}_2 = \mathrm{Br}_3 = 0$ for simplicity.

Finally, $\Gamma_{\not L}$ represents the interaction rate of the lepton violation process,

$$\Gamma_{\not L} \simeq \frac{9\zeta(3)}{16\pi^3}\lambda_{1,ii}^2\frac{T_R^3}{\Lambda_1^2}, \tag{11}$$

while the $\Gamma_{\rm brems}$ is the interaction rate of the thermalization process without the lepton number violation,

$$\Gamma_{\rm brems} \sim \alpha_2^2 T_R\sqrt{\frac{T_R}{m_{\rm inf}}}. \tag{12}$$

Here α_2 is the $SU(2)_L$ structure constant. We note that this process is suppressed due to the Landau-Pomeranchuk-Migdal effect [18]. Therefore, $\Gamma_{\not L}/\Gamma_{\rm brems}$ corresponds to the probability that the lepton number violating process occurs.

As a result, we obtain

$$\frac{n_B}{s} \simeq 8.7\times10^{-11}\left(\frac{4\times10^{-4}}{\alpha_2^2}\right)\left(\frac{m_{\rm inf}}{2\times10^{13}\,\mathrm{GeV}}\right)^{3/2}\left(\frac{T_R}{7\times10^{10}\,\mathrm{GeV}}\right)^{5/2} \times\left(\frac{m_\nu}{0.1\,\mathrm{eV}}\right)^2\left(\frac{10^{15}\,\mathrm{GeV}}{\Lambda_2}\right)^2\left(\frac{\mathrm{Br}\times\sum_j\lambda_{1,jj}\mathrm{Im}(\lambda_{2,1j})}{2}\right). \tag{13}$$

We can see that the observed baryon asymmetry is successfully generated.

Here we comment on the possible washout effect. The interaction rate of the washout process is

$$\Gamma_{\rm wash} \simeq \frac{11}{4\pi^3}\zeta(3)\frac{\sum m_\nu^2}{v^4}T^3. \tag{14}$$

From this, one can conclude that the strong wash out is avoided if the T_R is sufficiently small, that is, $T_R \lesssim 10^{13}\,\mathrm{GeV}$.

In order to confirm above estimation, we solve the following Boltzmann equations:

$$\begin{aligned}
H^2 &= \frac{1}{3M_{pl}^2}\left(\rho_{\rm inf} + \frac{\pi^2 g_*}{30}T^4 + \frac{m_{\rm inf}}{2}n_l\right),\\
\dot\rho_R + 4H\rho_R &= (1-\mathrm{Br})\Gamma_{\rm inf}\rho_{\rm inf} + \frac{m_{\rm inf}}{2}n_l\Gamma_{\rm brems},\\
\dot n_L + 3Hn_L &= \Gamma_{\not L}2\epsilon\, n_l - \Gamma_{\rm wash}n_L,\\
\dot n_l + 3Hn_l &= \frac{\Gamma_{\rm inf}\rho_{\rm inf}}{m_{\rm inf}}\mathrm{Br} - n_l\Gamma_{\rm brems},\\
\rho_{\rm inf} &= \Lambda_{\rm inf}^4\left(\frac{a(t=t_{\rm end})}{a}\right)^3 e^{-\Gamma_{\rm inf}t},
\end{aligned} \tag{15}$$

where dot represents the derivative respect to time t; H is the Hubble parameter; $\rho_{\rm inf}$ is the energy density of an inflaton; g_* is the effective degrees of freedom in the SM; T is the temperature of radiation; $\rho_R = \pi^2 g_* T^4/30$ is the energy density of radiation; n_l is the number density of left handed lepton with energy $m_{\rm inf}/2$ produced by the decay of an inflaton; $\Gamma_{\rm inf}$ is the decay rate of an inflaton;

$\Lambda_{\rm inf}^4$ is the energy density at the end of inflation; a is the scale factor; $t_{\rm end}$ is the time when inflation ends. We have checked that the numerical results agree with Eq. (13) within one order of magnitude. See the left panel of Fig. 1.

Now let us move to the estimation of the second contribution to the lepton asymmetry. First, the lepton flavor violation is occurred by the decay of an inflaton due to the interference between tree and one-loop decay process, see Fig. 3. Succeedingly, the lepton number is violated by the dimension-5 operator. Since the rate of lepton number violation is different for each flavor, we have nonzero lepton asymmetry. In order to illustrate the idea, we assume that an inflaton decays to lepton pairs by the dimension-5 operator

$$\frac{1}{M} y_{ij} \phi \bar{L}_i D_\mu \gamma^\mu L_j, \tag{16}$$

where M is the some scale, y_{ij} is the coupling and ϕ is the inflaton. By assuming that $\lambda_{1,11}$ is larger than $\lambda_{1,22}$ and $\lambda_{1,33}$, the net lepton asymmetry is given by

$$\frac{n_L}{s} \sim \frac{n_{\rm inf}}{s} \sum_{i=2,3} 2\epsilon_{1,i}\, {\rm Br}_{1i} \frac{\Gamma_{\not L,1} - \Gamma_{\not L,i}}{\Gamma_{\rm brems}}, \tag{17}$$

where ${\rm Br}_{ij}$ is the branching ratio of an inflaton to $L_i \bar{L}_j$, $\epsilon_{i,j}$ is

$$\begin{aligned}\epsilon_{i,j} &:= \frac{\Gamma(\phi \to L_i \bar{L}_j) - \Gamma(\phi \to \bar{L}_i L_j)}{\Gamma_{\rm inf}} \\ &\simeq \frac{1}{8\pi} \left(\frac{m_{\rm inf}^2}{\Lambda_2^2} \sum_{k,l} \frac{{\rm Im}(y_{ij}^* y_{kl} \lambda_{2,ijkl})}{|y_{ij}|^2} + \frac{m_{\rm inf}^2}{M^2} \sum_{k,l} \frac{{\rm Im}(y_{ij}^* y_{ik} y_{kl} y_{lj})}{|y_{ij}|^2} \right),\end{aligned} \tag{18}$$

and

$$\Gamma_{\not L,i} \simeq \frac{41\zeta(3)}{16\pi^3} \lambda_{1,ii}^2 \frac{T_R^3}{\Lambda_1^2}. \tag{19}$$

Here we have taken into account $LH \leftrightarrow \bar{L}\bar{H}$ in addition to $LL \leftrightarrow \bar{H}\bar{H}$.[2] Hereafter, we assume $\Lambda_2^2 \ll M^2$ and neglect the second term in Eq. (18). We leave the analysis of $\Lambda_2^2 \gtrsim M^2$ for the future publication. Then, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{n_B}{s} &\simeq 8.7 \times 10^{-11} \left(\frac{4 \times 10^{-4}}{\alpha_2^2} \right) \left(\frac{m_{\rm inf}}{2 \times 10^{13}\,{\rm GeV}} \right)^{3/2} \\ &\times \left(\frac{T_R}{7 \times 10^{10}\,{\rm GeV}} \right)^{5/2} \left(\frac{m_\nu}{0.1\,{\rm eV}} \right)^2 \left(\frac{10^{15}\,{\rm GeV}}{\Lambda_2} \right)^2 \\ &\times \left(\frac{\sum_{i=2,3} {\rm Br}_{1i}}{1} \right) \left(\frac{\sum {\rm Im}(y_{1i}^* y_{kl} \lambda_{2,1ikl})/|y_{1i}|^2}{1} \right).\end{aligned} \tag{20}$$

This contribution is the same order of magnitude as previous one.

[2] In the case of the first contribution, we only consider $LL \leftrightarrow \bar{H}\bar{H}$ because $LH \leftrightarrow \bar{L}\bar{H}$ does not lead to the net lepton asymmetry.



FIG. 1: Left: The contour where the first contribution(Eq.(15)) can explain the observed baryon asymmetry. Here we take $\sum_j \lambda_{1,jj} {\rm Im}(\lambda_{2,1j}) = 2$ and $m_\nu = 0.1\,{\rm eV}$. The solid and dashed lines correspond to $\Lambda_2 = 10^{14}\,{\rm GeV}$ and $\Lambda_2 = 10^{15}\,{\rm GeV}$, respectively. The red and blue lines represent Br $= 1$ and 0.1. In the blue region, because $T_R > m_{\rm inf}$, we need more careful study of the reheating, which is beyond scope of this paper. Right: Same as left figure, but considering the second contribution(Eq.(21)), taking $\sum {\rm Im}(y_{1i}^* y_{kl} \lambda_{2,1ikl})/|y_{1i}|^2 = 1$ and assuming $\lambda_{1,11}^2 \gg \lambda_{1,22}^2, \lambda_{1,33}^2$.

In this case, Boltzmann equations are the same as Eq. (15) except for the third line. Instead of the third line, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{n}_L + 3Hn_L &= -\sum_j 2\Gamma_{\not L,j} n_{Lj} - \Gamma_{\rm wash} n_L, \\ \dot{n}_{L1} - \dot{n}_{Lj} + 3H(n_{L1} - n_{Lj}) &= \frac{\Gamma_{\rm inf}\rho_{\rm inf}}{m_{\rm inf}} {\rm Br}_{1j}\, 2\epsilon_{1,j} \\ &\quad - (n_{L1} - n_{Lj})\Gamma_{\rm brems}, \quad (j = 2, 3)\end{aligned} \tag{21}$$

where n_{Li} is the lepton number asymmetry of L_i with energy $m_{\rm inf}/2$. In Fig. 1, we show contours which realizes the observed baryon asymmetry.

Finally we discuss the possible origin of the higher dimensional operators. For example, in the case of type-I seesaw, the dimension-5 and dimension-6 operators are generated by integrating out the right handed neutrino:

$$\frac{\lambda_{1,ij}}{\Lambda_1} \simeq (y_\nu m_N^{-1} y_\nu^T)_j^i, \quad \frac{\lambda_{2,ijkl}}{\Lambda_2^2} \simeq (y_\nu y_\nu^\dagger)_j^i (y_\nu y_\nu^\dagger)_l^k \frac{1}{16\pi^2 m_N^2}, \tag{22}$$

where y_ν is the neutrino Yukawa coupling and m_N is the right handed neutrino mass. We can see that the value of Λ_2 is $\mathcal{O}(10^{15})\,{\rm GeV}$ due to the one-loop suppression. Of course we have different Λ_2 for other seesaw models. In Zee model [20], $\Lambda_2 = \mathcal{O}(10^{13})\,{\rm GeV}$ because Λ_1 term is one-loop suppressed while Λ_2 term is generated at the tree level. In type-II seesaw [21] and Ma model [22], $\Lambda_2 = \mathcal{O}(10^{14})\,{\rm GeV}$ since Λ_1 and Λ_2 terms are the same order of magnitude. It would be interesting to examine the value of Λ_2 in various neutrino models.

Before concluding this letter, a few more remarks are given in order. Firstly, we emphasize that, since our analysis is only based on the effective Lagrangian, our



FIG. 2: The diagram contributing to the lepton asymmetry.



FIG. 3: The decay of an inflaton. The interference between the tree and the one-loop diagram induces the CP asymmetry.

scenario can be applicable to all mechanisms to generate neutrino Majorana masses. Secondly, although we do not consider in this paper, if the right handed neutrino is lighter than inflaton, it may be produced by the scattering between the SM particles. It may be interesting to investigate whether this scenario can explain the baryon asymmetry or not. Thirdly, our scenario goes well with the high scale inflation model. In the case of the quadratic chaotic inflation [19], we have $m_{\rm inf} \simeq 2 \times 10^{13}\,{\rm GeV}$. The observed baryon asymmetry is explained if the inflaton couples with the SM particles by the dimension-5 operator, $\Gamma_{\rm inf} \simeq \frac{1}{8\pi}\frac{m_{\rm inf}^3}{M_*^2}$, where $M_* \sim 10^{17}\,{\rm GeV}$. It is remarkable that M_* is close to the string/GUT scale, and that such a simple high scale inflation model actually realizes successful baryogenesis. It is also interesting to explore if other inflation scenarios such as Higgs inflation are consistent with this mechanism. Another interesting direction is to examine the flavor effects on our scenario. Finally, our scenario is excluded if it turns out that the neutrino is Dirac fermion or Majorana mass is very small compared to $\mathcal{O}(0.1)\,{\rm eV}$.

In conclusion, we have proposed a novel scenario for baryogenesis. We have shown that, even if the reheating temperature and an inflaton mass are smaller than a heavy particle mass, the observed baryon asymmetry is successfully generated. Our scenario is minimal in the sense that the model only has the particle contents of the SM and an inflaton, and therefore, this is the attractive alternative of thermal leptogenesis.

Acknowledgement

We thank Hikaru Kawai, Koji Tsumura and Masaki Yamada for useful discussions and comments. This work is supported by the Grant-in-Aid for Japan Society for the Promotion of Science (JSPS) Fellows No.251107 (YH) and No.271771 (KK).

[1] F. Bezrukov, M. Y. Kalmykov, B. A. Kniehl and M. Shaposhnikov, JHEP **1210** (2012) 140 [arXiv:1205.2893 [hep-ph]]; G. Degrassi, S. Di Vita, J. Elias-Miro, J. R. Espinosa, G. F. Giudice, G. Isidori and A. Strumia, JHEP **1208** (2012) 098 [arXiv:1205.6497 [hep-ph]]; S. Alekhin, A. Djouadi and S. Moch, Phys. Lett. B **716** (2012) 214 [arXiv:1207.0980 [hep-ph]].

[2] Y. Hamada, H. Kawai and K. y. Oda, Phys. Rev. D **87** (2013) 5, 053009 [Phys. Rev. D **89** (2014) 5, 059901] [arXiv:1210.2538 [hep-ph]]; F. Jegerlehner, Acta Phys. Polon. B **45** (2014) 6, 1167 [arXiv:1304.7813 [hep-ph]]; F. Jegerlehner, arXiv:1305.6652 [hep-ph]; Y. Hamada, H. Kawai and K. y. Oda, arXiv:1305.7055 [hep-ph].

[3] F. L. Bezrukov and M. Shaposhnikov, Phys. Lett. B **659** (2008) 703 [arXiv:0710.3755 [hep-th]]; A. Salvio, Phys. Lett. B **727** (2013) 234 [arXiv:1308.2244 [hep-ph]]; Y. Hamada, H. Kawai and K. y. Oda, PTEP **2014** (2014) 023B02 [arXiv:1308.6651 [hep-ph]]; Y. Hamada, H. Kawai, K. y. Oda and S. C. Park, Phys. Rev. Lett. **112** (2014) 24, 241301 [arXiv:1403.5043 [hep-ph]]; F. Bezrukov and M. Shaposhnikov, Phys. Lett. B **734** (2014) 249 [arXiv:1403.6078 [hep-ph]]; Y. Hamada, H. Kawai, K. y. Oda and S. C. Park, Phys. Rev. D **91** (2015) 5, 053008 [arXiv:1408.4864 [hep-ph]]; Y. Hamada, K. y. Oda and F. Takahashi, Phys. Rev. D **90** (2014) 9, 097301 [arXiv:1408.5556 [hep-ph]]; F. Bezrukov, J. Rubio and M. Shaposhnikov, arXiv:1412.3811 [hep-ph]; Y. Hamada, H. Kawai and K. y. Oda, Phys. Rev. D **92** (2015) 045009 [arXiv:1501.04455 [hep-ph]].

[4] C. D. Froggatt and H. B. Nielsen, Phys. Lett. B **368** (1996) 96 [hep-ph/9511371]; H. Kawai and T. Okada, Prog. Theor. Phys. **127** (2012) 689 [arXiv:1110.2303 [hep-th]]; H. Kawai, Int. J. Mod. Phys. A **28** (2013) 1340001; Y. Hamada, H. Kawai and K. Kawana, Int. J. Mod. Phys. A **29** (2014) 17, 1450099 [arXiv:1405.1310 [hep-ph]]; K. Kawana, arXiv:1405.2743 [hep-th]; Y. Hamada, H. Kawai and K. Kawana, PTEP **2015** (2015) 3, 033B06 [arXiv:1409.6508 [hep-ph]]; K. Kawana, PTEP **2015** (2015) 023B04 [arXiv:1411.2097 [hep-ph]]; K. Kawana, PTEP **2015** (2015) 073B04 [arXiv:1501.04482 [hep-ph]]; Y. Hamada and K. Kawana, arXiv:1506.06553 [hep-ph]; Y. Hamada, H. Kawai and K. Kawana, arXiv:1509.05955 [hep-th].

[5] P. A. R. Ade *et al.* [Planck Collaboration], arXiv:1502.01589 [astro-ph.CO].:

[6] M. Yoshimura, Phys. Rev. Lett. **41** (1978) 281 [Phys. Rev. Lett. **42** (1979) 746].

[7] I. Affleck and M. Dine, Nucl. Phys. B **249** (1985) 361.

[8] V. A. Kuzmin, V. A. Rubakov and M. E. Shaposhnikov, Phys. Lett. B **155** (1985) 36.

[9] M. Fukugita and T. Yanagida, Phys. Lett. B **174** (1986) 45.

[10] H. Aoki and H. Kawai, Prog. Theor. Phys. **98** (1997) 449 [hep-ph/9703421].
[11] G. 't Hooft, Phys. Rev. D **14** (1976) 3432 [Phys. Rev. D **18** (1978) 2199].
[12] F. R. Klinkhamer and N. S. Manton, Phys. Rev. D **30** (1984) 2212.
[13] G. Lazarides and Q. Shafi, Phys. Lett. B **258** (1991) 305; T. Asaka, K. Hamaguchi, M. Kawasaki and T. Yanagida, Phys. Lett. B **464** (1999) 12 [hep-ph/9906366]; T. Asaka, K. Hamaguchi, M. Kawasaki and T. Yanagida, Phys. Rev. D **61** (2000) 083512 [hep-ph/9907559].
[14] T. Hambye and G. Senjanovic, Phys. Lett. B **582** (2004) 73 [hep-ph/0307237].
[15] T. Hambye, Y. Lin, A. Notari, M. Papucci and A. Strumia, Nucl. Phys. B **695** (2004) 169 [hep-ph/0312203]; C. H. Albright and S. M. Barr, Phys. Rev. D **69** (2004) 073010 [hep-ph/0312224].
[16] B. Grzadkowski, M. Iskrzynski, M. Misiak and J. Rosiek, JHEP **1010** (2010) 085 [arXiv:1008.4884 [hep-ph]].
[17] P. Minkowski, Phys. Lett. B **67** (1977) 421; T. Yanagida, in Proceedings of the Workshop on Unified Theory and Baryon Number of the Universe, edited by O. Sawada and A. Sugamoto (KEK, Tsukuba, 1979); M. Gell-Mann, P. Ramond, and R. Slansky, in Supergravity, edited by P. van Niewenhuizen and D. Freedman (North Holland, Amsterdam, 1979) [arXiv:1306.4669 [hep-th]]; S. L. Glashow, NATO Sci. Ser. B **61** (1980) 687; R. N. Mohapatra and G. Senjanovic, Phys. Rev. Lett. **44** (1980) 912.
[18] L. D. Landau and I. Pomeranchuk, Dokl. Akad. Nauk Ser. Fiz. **92** (1953) 535; A. B. Migdal, Phys. Rev. **103** (1956) 1811; K. Harigaya, M. Kawasaki, K. Mukaida and M. Yamada, Phys. Rev. D **89** (2014) 8, 083532 [arXiv:1402.2846 [hep-ph]].
[19] A. D. Linde, Phys. Lett. B **129** (1983) 177.
[20] A. Zee, Phys. Lett. B **93** (1980) 389 [Phys. Lett. B **95** (1980) 461].
[21] J. Schechter and J. W. F. Valle, Phys. Rev. D **22** (1980) 2227; M. Magg and C. Wetterich, Phys. Lett. B **94** (1980) 61; G. Lazarides, Q. Shafi and C. Wetterich, Nucl. Phys. B **181** (1981) 287.
[22] E. Ma, Phys. Rev. D **73** (2006) 077301 [hep-ph/0601225].